Chiao Da Management Review
Vol. 31 No. 1, 2011
pp. 41-57

非對稱的促銷作用於顧客品牌之抉擇

Promotion Asymmetry Effects on Customer Brand Choice

許慧珍[1] Huei-Chen Hsu
環球科技大學 電子商務系
Department of Electronic Commerce, TransWorld University

摘要：研究是以高級品牌與次級品牌的價格及質量，兩維度的非對稱促銷作用對於顧客選擇品牌的影響變化。研究調查時間在 2007 年 8 月和 2009 年 8 月之間，以中國一個主要城市(深圳)的一些大雜貨連鎖店的消費顧客為調查對象。這次研究的結果支持品牌質量和價格促銷的確存在非對稱效果的假說。藉此研究的發現結果，提供管理者參考並予以後續研究者對於消費者品牌選擇之相關建議。
關鍵詞：非對稱促銷作用；品牌選擇；期望價格

Abstract: This research analyzes customer's brand choice of promotion effects on a High-tier brand and Low-tier brand products along dimensions of price and quality. The empirical findings are based on a self-administered survey of some big grocery chain stores in one major city (Shenzhen) in China between August 2007 and August 2009. The results of this survey support the hypothesis that a relation between brand quality position and price promotion asymmetry indeed exists. Also, managerial implications for the consumer brand choice are discussed and future research suggestions are proposed.
Keywords: Promotion asymmetry effect; Brand choice; Expected price

[1] Corresponding author: Department of Electronic Commerce , TransWorld University, Yunlin County, Taiwan, E-mail: maggie@twu.edu.tw

NATIONAL CENTRAL LIBRARY ROC

1. Introduction

A consumer faces a choice conflict in which the individual must select a choice from some set of alternatives (such as brands, price or general choice objectives). The consumer, after choosing one alternative, derives satisfaction from the product represented by its utility (Farquhar, 1977). For example, Kirmani and Wright (1989) demonstrated that consumers sometimes use their impression of the amount of money spent on advertising as a cue to the quality of a new product. Consider two brands competing in a given market. One brand offers high quality at a relatively high price, while the other offers at a lower price (consumer might not know the brand or its quality). Which brand will find it easier to attract customers of the other brand with a price promotion? If instead you faced a lower quality, lower cost brand, how would you feel about the savings or the decreased quality? Although much previous research on identifying the consumers' perception for choice behavior, but their studies are primary based on cross-sectional data (Kumar,2005; Tat and Bejou, 1994), no research has been directed specially at a longitudinal view of consumers' behavior in brand choice. The problem is that cross-sectional data cannot identify a consumer's "true" shopping behavior during the promotional period. Suppose consumers do not favor a certain product (not brand loyal), but purchase more of manufacturers-sponsored discount products on a trial basis. The positive result appeared in the cross-sectional data even if the consumer did not increase their brand loyalty over time. Any conclusions not based on longitudinal data could therefore be misleading, and the analysis would be at the least incomplete.

A robust review on the literature has revealed the focus more limited to the decision-making simplified rules for processing information that purport to lower decision-making costs (Bettman, 1977; Kumar, 2005). Some consumer researchers use economic paradigm for understanding the psychological aspects of price and price changes, especially as it concerns consumer reactions to a specific price for a particular brand (Monroe, 1990; Park and Kim, 2005). However, as Blattberg, Briesch, and Fox (1995) note, neither discipline is very

NATIONAL CENTRAL LIBRARY ROC

informative regarding consumer implications of more neither complex pricing contexts nor frequently changing prices.

We use a two-stage modeling procedure. The first stage is the investigation of how expected prices are formed. We propose past prices of the brand, customer characteristics, and situational factors as variables that may affect consumers' price expectation of the brand. Then, we develop a theory of choice that explicitly considers the difficulty in comparing diverse alternatives. To test customers are most likely to have a higher interest in High-tier Brand discounts than those Low-tier Brands discounts, we designed two kinds of coupon booklets for the participants to choose. The first booklet has the high price-quality mobile phone brands included (indicated as a "High-tier Brand" form), and the second booklet has the low price-quality soft-drink brands included (indicated as a "Low-tier Brand" form).

The next section reviews the literature on the relevant theoretical and empirical support for the choice theory and promotion asymmetry effect of customer brand choice. Section 3 introduces the expected price model. In section 4, the author characterizes the link between the data and the model estimation procedures. Then, in section 5, it shows the empirical findings from the expected price model results. Finally, the author summarizes the results and discusses the implications from the model application and the limitations of the study in the last section.

2. Theory and Hypotheses

2.1. Choice Theory

A number of previous research efforts investigate whether there is any asymmetry in consumer response to deviations of actual prices from reference prices. This effect is typically motivated, by the well-known value function of prospect theory (Kahneman and Tversky, 1979). However, these applications face an important barrier: prospect theory was originally developed to describe by a single attribute (often amounts of money). Thus most applications to brand choice

have involved a single attribute, usually price. However, Tversky and Kahneman (1991) develop a theoretical framework for value functions involving multiple attributes. This has broad implications for the analysis of consumer choice. The basic ideas are that: (1) each choice alternative can be decomposed into a set of values on attributes, (2) each attribute can be described by its own value function, with its own specific characteristics, and (3) alternatives are evaluated relative to a reference point. Their new framework suggests that all choice alternatives are compared against a common reference point in the multi-attribute space. This reference-dependent evaluation of an attribute applies not just to price but also to all other product attributes as well (e.g., quality).

2.2. Promotion Asymmetry Effect

Blattberg and Wisniewski (1989) finding shared by Allenby and Rossi (1991); Hardie, Johnson, and Fader (1993), assumes that the high quality brands have a principle advantage in promotion effectiveness. They take price as a proxy for quality, i.e., implicitly assume a fixed relation between price and quality and show that promotions of higher quality brands are more effective than promotions of lower quality brands.

Several explanations have been offered for this phenomenon. Originally, Blattberg and Wisniewski (1989) argued that the equilibrium distribution of customer types must be such that the consumers of low quality brands are more sensitive than the consumers of high quality brands. Hence, when a low quality brand promotes, it attracts customers of similar or lower price brands, but not those who were quality-sensitive enough to buy a high quality brand in the first place.

Allenby and Rossi (1991) relied on recent advances in customer economics to predict that, regardless of the distribution of consumer types, we should expect that higher quality brands will have a promotion advantage. They suggested that a higher quality brands can be regarded as a superior goods, and the low quality brands as inferior goods. Therefore, the substitution pattern between these brands may not be understood when both price and wealth effects are taken into account. A promotion has a positive wealth effect that favors superior goods, and therefore

NATIONAL CENTRAL LIBRARY 國家圖書館 ROC

switching up is more likely than switching down. Thus, this theory always gives the advantage to promotions of the higher quality brand.

In real world markets, price discounts move consumers from lower-quality to higher-quality brands more than from higher-quality to lower-quality brands (Blattberg and Wisniewski, 1989). For instance, consumers primarily regard price promotions as a chance to buy quality brands which they usually consider too expensive.

In this respect, with the previous research found, therefore, the study has the hypothesis as following:

H1: The price promotion effectiveness of High-tier Brand is superior, whereas for the Low-tier Brand the reverse will hold.

3. Econometric Modeling

Kahneman and Tversky (1979) have simplified the conceptualization of how customers use price information in making brand choices in their prospect theory. Recall that we define a brand's expected price as the price customers expect to pay for the brand on a given purchase occasion, but there are no notions of a reference in making purchase decisions, such as "fair price" (Kumar, 2005). Thaler (1985) has proposed the concept of transaction utility to explain customer choice behavior. He argues that in addition to acquisition utility, which is a function of the difference between the reservation and market prices, customers can derive utility from a transaction depending solely on the perceived merits of the "deal". Blattberg *et al.*, (1995) note that exchange goods that are given up "as intended" do not exhibit loss aversion. In other words, we would expect an internal reference price (the expected price) to be a more important construct in affecting consumers purchase behavior than external reference price (e.g., a manufacturer's suggested list price) because consumers are knowledgeable about prices of brands.

The primary goal is to test and assess the role of price expectations in customers' brand choice by using an econometric approach. Following the utility

NATIONAL CENTRAL LIBRARY 國家圖書館 ROC

model with constant loss aversion, as described by Tversky and Kahneman (1991), each brand I (i=1,…,N)is defined as a two-attribute coordinate (p_i, q_i), describing its regular price and its quality. Denoting the reference brand by r, the utility function is written

$$U_r(i)=u_r(pi)+u_r(qi), \text{ with } \quad u_r(p_i) = \beta_p(p_r-p_i) \quad \text{if } p_i <= p_r;$$
$$\text{otherwise} = \alpha_p(p_r-p_i) \quad \text{if } p_i > p_r$$
$$u_r(q_i) = \beta_q(q_i-q_r) \quad \text{if } q_i >= q_r;$$
$$\text{otherwise} = \alpha_q(q_i-q_r) \quad \text{if } q_i < q_r$$
$$\text{and } \alpha_p > \beta_p >= 0,\ \alpha_q > \beta_q >= 0 \text{ (loss aversion).} \qquad (1)$$

The probability that a choice alternative i is chosen by customer k is given by

$$P_{ik(n)} = Pr[U_{ik(n)} >= U_{jk(n)} \quad j = 1,2,\ldots g,] \qquad (2)$$

That is, customer k will choose the alternative with the highest utility. Pik(n) is a conditional probability function. Further, for simplicity, assume that deterministic component of the utility that customer k derives from the purchase of a given choice alternative or brand-size is a linear utility function.

The study estimated a logit model similar to the one of Hardie, Johnson, and Fader（1993）. The deterministic part for brand *i* at occasion *t* contains gains and losses in price and quality, i.e.

$$\text{Q-Loss}_{it} = (q_i - q_{rt}) \quad \text{if } q_i < q_{rt} \quad \text{Otherwise} = 0 \qquad \text{if } q_i >= q_{rt};$$
$$\text{Q-Gain}_{it} = (q_i - q_{rt}) \quad \text{if } q_i >= q_{rt} \quad \text{Otherwise} = 0 \qquad \text{if } q_i < q_{rt};$$
$$\text{P-Loss}_{it} = (p_{rt} - p_{it}) \quad \text{if } p_{it} > p_{rt} \quad \text{Otherwise} = 0 \qquad \text{if } p_{it} <= p_{rt};$$
$$\text{P-Gain}_{it} = (p_{rt} - p_{it}) \quad \text{if } p_{it} <= p_{rt} \quad \text{Otherwise} = 0 \qquad \text{if } p_{it} > p_{rt};$$

Where the reference point, r, is defined by the last price paid and the last quality purchased. Then the study further specified the deterministic part of the *utility function* as:

$$V_{(n)} = \alpha_p \text{ P - Loss}_{it} + \beta_p \text{ P-Gain}_{it} + \alpha_q \text{ Q - Loss}_{it} \qquad (3)$$
$$+ \beta_q \text{ Q - Gain}_{it} + \beta_f \text{ FEATURE}_{it} + \beta_d \text{ PROM}_{it} + \beta_i \text{ LOYALTY}_{it}$$

where loyalty is defined as in Guadagni and Little (1983) and is specific coefficients.

$$\begin{aligned} Y_i = {} & \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{MARITAL STATUS}_i + \beta_2 \text{EMPLOYMENT}_i + \beta_3 \text{INCOME}_i \quad (4) \\ & + \beta_4 \text{PRESENCE of YOUNG CHILDREN}_i + \beta_5 \text{GENDER}_i \\ & + \beta_6 \text{EDUCATION}_i + \beta_7 \text{BRANDSWITCHING}_i \\ & + B_8 Ln(\text{AGE}_i) + \beta_9 Ln(\text{PRIORUSE}_i) \end{aligned}$$

Parameters Y_i can be thought of as *the individual-specific brand choice effects* [2]. Accordingly, those parameters represent the between-individuals variation in brand choice explained by differences in time-invariant characteristics.

Where "Marital Status, Employment, Income, Presence of Young Children, Gender, Education and Brand-Switching" are individual-specific dummy variables, while *Ln* (AGE *i*) is the log of the participant's age at the beginning of the program, and *Ln* (PRIORUSE *i*) is the log of the frequency of brand choice during a pretest period. However, the inclusion of a time-invariant regressor within equation(4)is not possible, because all time-invariant variables drop out of the transformed specification of equation (4) [3]. To get around this problem, a pretest was performed two months ahead of the promotion so as to gather the redemption frequency for the sample coupons. Individual data were obtained and tentatively divided into five groups of mean monthly usage (PRIORUSE): (1) Non-user (Frequency(F)=0), (2) Light user (F=1-2), (3) Median-light user (F=3-4), (4) Median user (F=5-6), and (5) Heavy user ($F=7^{+}$).

Taking the derivative of equation (4) with respect to PRIORUSE yields

$$\left(\frac{\partial Y_i}{\partial PRIORUSE}\right)_{EQUATION(4)} = \frac{\beta_8}{PRIORUSE_i} \qquad (5)$$

---

[2] We employed Hardie *et al.*, (1993) specification test for random versus fixed model. The hypothesis that the individual effects are uncorrected with regressors is rejected ($\chi^2 = 10.56$, $P < 0.01$).

[3] The time-invariant variables could also not be included in equation (4) because these variables can be represented by a linear combination of the vectors of individual-specific dummy variables.

NATIONAL CENTRAL LIBRARY ROC

Equation (5) estimates the effect of prior experience independent of the participation effect.

4. Description of Data and Variables

Table 1 reports the descriptions of variables used in the analysis and summary statistics for the total observation samples, with data collected through a self-administered survey of some big grocery chain stores in one major city (Shenzhen) in China between August 2007 and August 2009. In the first two data collection phrases, a total of 357 subjects were randomly selected in the checkout lines. They were requested to complete a preliminary survey and mail back all grocery shopping receipts for two months (all were offered a small monetary incentive for their assistance). Of 357 subjects, 269 mailed their receipts back in prepaid envelopes and the number of coupons use was counted and summed over all the receipts submitted by each subjects. In the second phase, we asked the subjects to participate in the manufacturers-sponsored promotion program, and of these, 228 (N=228*)* agreed to join the two-year program (and hence, T=24*)*. A letter of appreciation and introduction and a list of ten sponsored coupons such as soft-drink goods, and mobile phones were sent to each participant. With the cooperation of manufacturers, there were three kinds of expiration dates offered for the coupon-one week, two weeks, and three weeks. The coupon book carries the same expiration date each month and each product also carries the face value in a specific month.

To test the hypothesis, we designed two coupon books for the participants to choose. The coupon book was mailed at the beginning of each month and only useful at the designated grocery stores. A telephone survey was also conducted each month to solicit general opinions from participants about the coupon books and for information use. Redemption was measured by asking each participant to go through the coupon book, indicating how many coupons were used. The participants were free to withdraw from the program anytime over the phone. The final sample consisted of 62% who are women with an average of 25 years old, an average of 0.2 young children, and a mean income of $165 per month.

NATIONAL CENTRAL LIBRARY ROC

Table 1

Summary Statistics for the Data Sets

Variable	Definition	Sample Means (N=228)
PART	The amount of time(s) that an ith individual participates in the promotion program (2 years).	41.82
INCOME (per month)	Dummy variables taking the value 1 if (1)income≦$150, 0 otherwise; (2) income > $150 and income≦$200, 0 otherwise; (3) income > $200, 0 otherwise;	(1) 36% (2) 32% (3) 32%
EDUCATION	Dummy variables taking the value 1 if (1) education≦high school, 0 otherwise; (2) education≦college, 0 otherwise; (3)education ≦ graduate, 0 otherwise (4) education > graduate, 0 otherwise	(1) 5% (2) 75% (3) 11% (4) 9%
MARTIAL STATUS	Dummy variable taking the value 1 if married at time t and 0 if single	18%
PRESENCE OF YOUNG CHILDREN	Dummy variables taking the value 1 if (1)size = 0, 0 otherwise; (2) 1≦size, 0 otherwise	(1) 80% (2) 20%
EMPLOYMENT	Dummy variable taking the value 1 if employed at time t and 0 otherwise	58%
GENDER	Dummy variable taking the value 1 if female at time t and 0 otherwise	62%
PRIORUSE	Number of coupon usages prior to the actual promotion activities(per month)	0.73
BRAND-SWITCHING	Dummy variable taking the value 1 if the participant prefers the low brand-tier and 0 otherwise	45%
AGE	Age at time of current observation	25

Variable	Definition	Sample Means (N=228)
PART	The amount of time(s) that an ith individual participates in the promotion program (2 years).	41.82
INCOME (per month)	Dummy variables taking the value 1 if (1) income ≦ $150, 0 otherwise; (2) income > $150 and income ≦ $200, 0 otherwise; (3) income > $200, 0 otherwise;	(1) 36% (2) 32% (3) 32%
EDUCATION	Dummy variables taking the value 1 if (1) education ≦ high school, 0 otherwise; (2) education ≦ college, 0 otherwise; (3) education ≦ graduate, 0 otherwise (4) education > graduate, 0 otherwise	(1) 5% (2) 75% (3) 11% (4) 9%
MARTIAL STATUS	Dummy variable taking the value 1 if married at time t and 0 if single	18%
PRESENCE OF YOUNG CHILDREN	Dummy variables taking the value 1 if (1) size = 0, 0 otherwise; (2) 1 ≦ size, 0 otherwise	(1) 80% (2) 20%
EMPLOYMENT	Dummy variable taking the value 1 if employed at time t and 0 otherwise	58%
GENDER	Dummy variable taking the value 1 if female at time t and 0 otherwise	62%
PRIORUSE	Number of coupon usages prior to the actual promotion activities(per month)	0.73
BRAND-SWITCHING	Dummy variable taking the value 1 if the participant prefers the low brand-tier and 0 otherwise	45%
AGE	Age at time of current observation	25

5. Statistical Results

5.1. The Main Results

The most general managerial implication of this paper is that if consumer brand choice varied with different coupon discount. The summary statistics for participants are presented in Table 1. The mean usage for total coupon is 41.82 times in experiment period (two years). Table 2 reports the main results from the empirical analysis. The estimates consist of coefficient estimated for the fixed-effects model represented by equation (4). The form equation includes a Brand-Switching dummy variable, which attempted to identify any variation in brand choice behavior due to changes in discount. The Brand-Switching coefficient (0.565) for low-tier brand is not significant, whereas the coefficient (1.96*) for high-tier brand is significant that indicates participants are most likely to have a higher interest in high-tier brand discounts.

And the estimates reported in Table 2 comprise the basis for separating the effect of prior use from the effect of length of participation in the program. These results were obtained using the calculated values---as individual observations of the dependent variable in a regression equation having a general specification for equation (5) and provided a measure of the contribution of specific, time-invariant variables on observed differences in the means coupon usage of individual participants. The log coefficients of prior use in the two data sets are both significant (-1.265* and -1.233*) which can be interpreted as that the participants are likely to increase coupon usage frequency when a discount exists.

5.2. Price Asymmetry Effects Model Estimation and Results

We use two forms of coupon booklet and divides into two data sets. The first one contains choice data from soft drink category, and the second data consists of choice data from the mobile phone category. Both data sets have five brands. A description of the data sets, including their positioning in the price-quality quadrant, is provided in Table 3.

Table 2

Estimation of the effect of participation on coupon use

Variables	Low-tier Brand	High-tier Brand
Brand-Switching	0.565(1.54)	1.96(2.89) *
EXPIRATION DATES	2.084(2.08)*	2.463(2.53)*
FACE VALUE	1.453(1.32)	2.434(3.71)*
MARITAL STATUS	0.892(0.95)	0.732(1.01)
EMPLOYMENT	0.755(1.84)	0.724(1.79)
PRESENCE OF YOUNG CHILDREN		
Size = 0	0.441(1.47)	0.487(1.38)
1≦size or higher	0.201(1.37)	0.274(1.68)
EDUCATION		
education≦high school	0.02(0.98)	0.01(0.71)
education≦college	1.85(2.57)*	1.97(2.79) *
education≦graduate	1.25(1.85)	2.01(2.19)
education>graduate	0.85(1.89)	1.79(1.67)
INCOME（per month）		
$0-150	1.232(2.47)*	0.811(1.02)
$151-200	-0.124(1.78)	-1.532(3.25)*
$201 or higher	-1.051(1.01)	-0.686(1.97)
GENDER	0.673(1.48)	1.021(1.03)
Ln(AGE)	2.345(1.65)	1.226(1.32)
Ln(PRIORUSE)	-1.265(3.42)*	-1.233(3.25)*
Adjusted R^2	0.588	0.615
Observations	104	124

Note: Asymptotic t-statistics are reported in parentheses and calculated from White's standard errors. Asterisks identify significance at 5 percent level (two-tailed test). Note that there is no constant term in the equation, so the usual interpretation of R^2 is not valid.

The estimation results of the logit model are presented in Table 4. Two remarks are in order. First, in the mobile phone category, there is no appreciation for quality gains (-0.66*) relative to the reference point. Consumers are however, sensitive to relative quality losses. Second, in soft drink category, the PROM parameter (0.19*) is significant which shows evidence for consumers preference under price promotion condition. As suggested before, there exists a strong correlation between price and quality across brands.

Table 3

Description of the Data (Quality and Average Prices)

	Price($)	Quality	Promotion Intensity[a]	Discount($) (given 10% off)	Choice Share (%)
Low-tier Brands (Soft Drink)					
Brand 1	1.05	0.78	0.10	0.13	18%
Brand 2	0.85	0.76	0.08	0.11	17%
Brand 3	0.75	0.70	0.07	0.09	21%
Brand 4	0.64	0.69	0.06	0.08	22%
Brand 5	0.42	0.65	0.04	0.08	22%
High-tier Brands (Mobile Phone)					
Brand 1	315.00	0.89	0.26	31.00	35%
Brand 2	250.00	0.75	0.27	25.00	23%
Brand 3	212.00	0.70	0.24	21.00	18%
Brand 4	185.00	0.65	0.27	18.00	15%
Brand 5	127.00	0.61	0.23	12.00	9%

[a] Number of promoted occasions divided by the number of occasions the brand is available.

Table 4

Estimation of Structure Parameters

		Soft Drink		Mobile Phone	
		Parameter	**Std. Error**	**Parameter**	**Std. Error**
Marketing Mix					
Q-Gain	β_q	1.88	0.45	-0.66[a]	0.73
Q-Loss	α_q	3.45	0.35	3.01	0.66
P-Gain	β_p	1.92	0.24	1.01	0.23
P-Loss	α_p	2.66	0.24	3.36	0.21
Feature	β_f	0.61	0.12	0.74	0.07
Prom	β_d	0.19[a]	0.11	0.68	0.06
Loyalty					
Brand 1	β_{brand1}	4.58	0.25	5.83	0.46
Brand 2	β_{brand2}	4.16	0.33	4.42	0.35
Brand 3	β_{brand3}	5.64	0.58	4.37	0.52
Brand 4	β_{brand4}	7.01	0.64	3.67	0.47
Brand 5	β_{brand5}	6.88	0.54	2.58	0.25
Log Likelihood		-89		-77	
U^2		0.53		0.44	
$\overline{U}^2$		0.52		0.43	

[a] Parameter is insignificant at 0.01 level.

$\overline{U}^2$: reflects model fit adjusted for the number of estimated parameters.

5.3. The Overall Direction of Asymmetry

Using a regression on the price-quality data in Table 4, we expect that; overall, the promotion effectiveness of High-tier Brand in the mobile Phone data set is superior, whereas for the soft drink data set the reverse will hold. The empirical finding indicates that typically there is an asymmetric promotion effect in favor of High-tier Brand, which is consistent with the hypothesis.

6. General Discussion

This paper uses two forms of coupon programs, which activated simultaneously, showing the High-tier Brand form yield a better participation rate and greater coupon use than the Low-tier Brand coupon form. Drawing from the implication of promotion asymmetry effect, the theoretical analysis serves to generalize the framework previously proposed by Kumar (2005); and B&W (1989). While higher quality/ price brands may have a promotion advantage in principle; however, we believe that the changing pattern of brand positioning, as a newly unknown brand (e.g., store brand) improve their quality; can have a significant impact on future regularities regarding promotion advantages.

6.1. Theoretical Contribution

The principal contribution of this research is to the literature on the promotion asymmetric effects of the consumer's brand choice. The research's approach to promotion effectiveness measurement tests and assesses the role of price expectations in customers' brand choice. In contrast to previous work on the literature (Winer, 1986), the study has revealed the focus more limited to the discussion of brand choice model which incorporates concepts from the behavioral pricing literature. The research process assumes the participants make a dimension-by-dimension comparison of the price promotion and arrive at a decision they can justify on the basis of the comparison. Research has been more limited on examining reference prices and their effects on buyer behavior and brand choice. This study shows that promotion asymmetry effect exists in



consumer brand choice. That is, buyers may have different preference strengths for High-tier brands and Low-tier brands.

The findings also contribute to the literature on brand choice behavior and suggest that perception of the promotion effects depends on how brand price/quality is overlaid across them.

6.2. Managerial Implications

The article raises a note of caution about promotion asymmetry effect and show that a High-tier brand can has a superior price promotion effect. In actual purchasing situations, consumers often encounter products successively rather than simultaneously. That is to say, individuals are likely to make spontaneous evaluations of the individual products they encounter before making a choice. The findings have implications for a better understanding of the brand portfolio promotion and make final implementation decisions. The findings also suggest that managers should consider the determinants of coupon usage. Despite substantial research along this line, little has been directed towards relating this issue to the promotion asymmetry effect. Although the study shows that there is a significant promotion asymmetry in coupon brand choice, previous literature, such as Nielsen and Clarke (1987), have suggested that coupon promotion effectiveness research should be conducted in several cities, because effectiveness differs from place to place. Thus, further research is suggested to expand this issue across cities or compare the cultural discrepancies in coupon-use behavior among different countries.

An important implication of the findings from company standpoint is that managers can obtain information about a consumer's prior brand choice beforehand in order to ensure that they send coupons to the appropriate target consumers.

7. Limitations and directions for future research

Although the findings from this study support the hypothesis, there are limitations of this work. First, by collecting data only in Shenzhen city in China,

this study is not representative of all Chinese, in this country where regional differences abound. The dilemma is that to test the hypothesized model we need to sample a large number in equivalent way. The previously mentioned concerns and limitations should be considered in understanding the meaning of the findings.

Second, the major limitation of the study concerns the measurement approach. Thus, further research is suggested to expand this issue across cities or compare the cultural discrepancies in brand choice behavior among different countries. Third, to that extend, the results may not generalize to categories across which promotion effect to be asymmetric. In this regard, future research will be suggested to find any evidence for perspective brand switching under the same product category when participants are simply asked to state their preferences. Whereas this article focused on the asymmetry effect, future examination will be important to realize that other effects on brand choice, such as the image evoked by pictures on the ad, and through advertisements playing what kind of the mediating role in the brand decision process will also need to be examined.

The modern Chinese consumers, especially the more educated and affluent urbanites, may also base their brand choice decisions on the information acquires through advertising (Park and Kim, 2005). To attract such affluent consumers, who presumably have greater disposable income; marketers should have more aggressive promotion strategies.

8. References

Allenby, G.M. and Rossi, P.E. (1991), "Quality Perceptions and Asymmetric Switching Between Brands," *Marketing Science*, 10(2),185-204.

Blattberg, Robert C., Briesch, R. and Fox, E.J. (1995), "How Promotions Work," *Marketing Science,* 14(2), 122-132.

Blattberg, R. C. and Wisniewski, K.J. (1989), "Price-Induced Patterns of Competition," *Marketing Science*, 8(3),291-309.

Bettman, J.R.(1977),"Data collection and Analysis Approaches for Studying

Consumer Information Processing," *Advances in Consumer Research,* 4(1), 342-348.

Farquhar, P. (1977), *A Survey of Multi-attribute Utility Theory and Applications,* In TIMS Studies in the *Management Sciences,* 6.eds. Martin K. Starr and Milan Zeleny, Amsterdam: North Holland Publishing Co., 59-89.

Hardie, B., Johnson, G.E. and Fader, P.S. (1993), "A Logit Model of Brand Choice Calibrated on Scanner Data," *Marketing Science*, 2(2), 203-238.

Kahneman, D. and Tversky, A. (1979), "Prospect Theory: an Analysis of Decision under Risk," *Econometrica,* 47(2), 263-91.

Kirmani, A. and Wright, P. (1989), "Money Talks: Perceived Advertising Expense and Expected Product Quality," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 16(4), 344-353.

Kumar, P. (2005), "Brand: The Impact of Brand Extension Success versus Failure," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 42(2), 183-194.

Monroe, K.B. (1990), *Pricing: Making Profitable Decisions,* New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Nielsen, A. and Clarke, S. (1987), "Relating the Brand Use Profile of Coupon Redeemers to Brand and Coupon Characteristics," *Journal of Advertising Research*, 27(3), 23-32.

Park, J. and Kim, J.K. (2005),"The Effects of Decoys on Preference Shifts: The Role Of Attractiveness and Providing Justification," *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 15(2), 94-107.

Tat, K. and Bejou, D.(1994), "Examining Black Consumer Motives for Coupon Usage," *Journal of Advertising research,* 34(2), 29-35.

Thaler, R. (1985), "Mental Accounting and Consumer Choice," *Marketing Science,*4(2), 199-214.

Tversky, A. and Kahneman, D. (1991),"Loss Aversion and Riskless Choice: A Reference Dependent Model," *Quarterly Journal of Economics,* 106(6), 1039-1061.

Winer,R.S.(1986), "A Reference Price Model of Brand Choice for Frequently Purchased Products," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 13(3), 250-256.

NATIONAL CENTRAL LIBRARY ROC